

## **Remarks**

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, dated **January 24, 2006** (“Action”), in which claims 1-13 and 15-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being clearly unpatentable over Doiron (US Patent 5,968,197 “Doiron”) in view of Dunning et al. (US Patent 6,760,307 “Dunning”).

## **Current Status of Claims:**

With this amendment, claims 1-13 and 15-24 remain pending. Applicants offer to amend claims 1, 7, 13 and 18 as presented above. Support for these amendments can be found in the original specification, claims and/or figures. In this regard, no new matter has been introduced.

## **Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Relevant portions of claim 1, as currently amended, are as follows:

“An apparatus to communicate on a point-to-point communication link, the apparatus comprising:  
a data path input unit to receive a packet on the point-to-point communication link from a transmitting device that does not expect an acknowledgement of a successful completion and does not expect an acknowledgment of an unsuccessful completion for a request transaction;...

Emphasis added.

In the Action on page 3, it is stated that “Doiron does not explicitly teach or disclose that the sender or the transmitter does not expect an acknowledgment of a successful or unsuccessful completion.” Thus Examiner admits that Doiron does not teach or suggest the above emphasized parts of claim 1.

Dunning also does not teach or suggest the above emphasized parts of claim 1. Dunning discloses an expectation for a successful acknowledgement (ACK) in order to reuse full send buffers. See Col. 5, lines 9-11. Dunning also discloses an expectation for a negative acknowledgement (NAK) in order to determine at what point to resend a stream of packets of unsuccessfully received packets that were placed into the send buffer. See Col. 5, lines 30-33. Since Dunning has an expectation for successful and unsuccessful acknowledgments, Dunning does not teach or suggest the above emphasized parts of claim 1.

Since Doiron and Dunning fail to teach or suggest the above emphasized parts of claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of this claim. Independent claims 7, 13 and 18 also include similar elements to those of the emphasized parts of claim 1 above. Thus, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of these independent claims be withdrawn as well as all pending dependent claims. The pending dependent claims are claims 2-6, 8-12, 15-17 and 19-24.

## **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that claims 1-13 and 15-24, as currently amended, are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. ***The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.***

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,  
Gary Solomon, et al.

Date: April 24, 2006

by: /s/Ted A. Crawford/Reg. No. 50,610/  
Ted A. Crawford, Reg. No. 50,610  
Patent Attorney for Assignee Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation  
PO Box 5326  
SC4-202  
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326  
Tel. (503) 712.2799